PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

	Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item
	ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION		
	Title:		
☑	Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review
N/A, first review.	Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such
N/A, not registered.	Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number
	Authors:		
☑	Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author
☑	Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review
N/A, no represented amendments	Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments
	Support:		
N/A, no support required.	Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review
N/A, no sponsored article.	Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor
N/A, no sponsored article.	Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol
	INTRODUCTION		
☑	Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known
☑	Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)
	METHODS		
☑	Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review
☑	Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage
☑	Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated
	Study records:		

☑	Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review
☑, figure 1. Articles selection done by first author.	Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)
☑, figure 1. Data extraction done by first author.	Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators
☑	Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications
☑, PICO	Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale
☑, limitation described in discussion	Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis
N/A, no meta-analysis performed	Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised
		15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2, Kendall's τ)
N/A, no meta-analysis performed		15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)
N/A, no meta-analysis performed		15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned
N/A, no meta-analysis performed	Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)
N/A, no meta-analysis performed	Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.

Article information: http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/ls-20-111.